

REMARKS

In the August 13, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 pending in the application. Claims 1-10 (3 independent claims; 10 total claims) remain pending in the application. Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA"), in view of John L. Weston, UK Patent Application, GB 2174663A (hereinafter "Weston"), Farmakis et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,314,366, issued November 6, 2001 (hereinafter "Farmakis"), and Hyatt, Jr., U.S. Patent No. 5,604,489, issued February 18, 1997 (hereinafter "Hyatt"). In addition, claims 4, 7, and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA, in view of Weston and Farmakis, and further in view of Aerospace Engineering (December 1994, hereinafter "Aerospace Engineering"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claims 1, 5, and 7 recite a rotary knob "wherein said rotation of said knob corresponds to a **specific alphanumeric value**." (emphasis added) As noted by the Examiner (see Page 3 of the Office Action), AAPA and Weston fail to "teach that the knob is used to enter an alphanumeric." The Examiner asserts that Farmakis teaches "it is conventional for a rotary knob used to enter an alphanumeric." In particular, the Examiner states "the knob (fig. 5 (106)) has to select an alphanumeric in order for the display (fig. 5 (100, 106)) to display alphanumeric/numeric." Applicant disagrees with Examiner's characterization of Farmakis.

Farmakis generally discloses a satellite based collision avoidance system. Figure 5 of Farmakis illustrates a control panel that may be used with a control unit 68 of the collision avoidance system. The control unit 68 "comprises: alphanumeric display 100; control knobs 102; buttons 104; control knob 106; and **numeric** display 108." (col. 12, line 66 – col. 13, line 1) The control knob 106 "selects the altitude window that is displayed in **numeric** display 108." (col. 13, lines 1-3) "The altitude window is the pilot's intended level off altitude." (col. 13, lines 10-11) In particular, "the pilot may select knob 106 the level off altitude, e.g. 12, 000 feet." As

such, Applicant asserts that Farmakis teaches a control knob that may be used to select a **numeric** value, however, Farmakis does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a rotary knob “wherein said rotation of said knob corresponds to a **specific alphanumeric value**” as recited by independent claims 1, 5, and 7.

Hyatt was not specifically applied by the Examiner to the pending claims. It is well-settled that the Examiner bears the burden of setting forth a detailed evidentiary basis for the teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the cited references. The Office Action fails to provide such an evidentiary basis for Hyatt. As recently stated by the Federal Circuit, the factual inquiry of whether to combine references must be thorough and searching, and must be based upon objective evidence of record. *In re Sang Su Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The Examiner must therefore set forth, in detail, its findings and the grounds for the findings, as supported by the record, and must explain its application of law to the found facts. No such evidence or explanation is provided in the Office Action for Hyatt. Accordingly, rejection of the pending claims under Hyatt cannot stand and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In addition, Hyatt is non-analogous art. Hyatt discloses an electronic input terminal that is used for “entering access codes to open a locked door or the like.” (col. 1, lines 5-10) Thus, there is no motivation to combine Hyatt with the satellite based collision avoidance system of Farmakis or the aircraft instrument display of Weston.

Furthermore, Aerospace Engineering does not supply the missing elements of independent claims 1, 5, and 7. As noted by the Examiner, Aerospace Engineering is cited for generally disclosing using a cursor to select a desired parameter and for “suggesting that a joystick can also be used in an aircraft input device.” (see Page 4 of the Office Action) As Aerospace Engineering simply discloses an aircraft cursor control device that utilizes a cursor to select a parameter and that utilizes a joystick, Aerospace Engineering does not teach or suggest a rotary knob “wherein said rotation of said knob corresponds to a **specific alphanumeric value**.”

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that each and every element of independent claims 1, 5 and 7 are not rendered obvious by AAPA in view of Weston, Farmakis, and Hyatt or by AAPA in view of Weston and Farmakis and further in view of Aerospace Engineering. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal to rejection of claims 1, 5, and 7 (and

claims 2-4, 6, and 8-10 which variously depend from claims 1, 5 and 7) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims, namely 1-10, fully comply with 35 U.S.C §112 and are allowable over the art of record.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that further amendments should be made to improve the form of the claims, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 13-Nov-2000

By: David O. Caplan
David O. Caplan
Reg. No. 41,655

Attorney for:
Honeywell International Inc.
Law Dept. AB
P.O. Box 2245
Morristown, New Jersey 07962-9806
(602) 382-6284
(602) 382-6070 - Facsimile